

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/631,100	07/31/2003	Dale L. Partin	DP-309294	7754	
22851 7590 04/18/2007 DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			EXAMINER		
M/C 480-410-202			NASSER, ROBERT L		
PO BOX 5052 TROY, MI 480			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3735		
	•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ú
٣

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/631,100	PARTIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Robert L. Nasser	3735		

Advisory Action	10/631,100 PARTIN ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert L. Nasser	3735				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>19 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, whi	chever is later. In			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	E FIRST REPLY WAS F	LED WITHIN			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office te of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as even if timely filed,			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since			
AMENDMENTS		•				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	∐ will not be entered, or b) ∐ will will will will will will will wi	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nt before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	t be entered necessary and			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections un de r ap p er y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	The status of the claims after e	inty is below or attach	ou.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu see attached:	t does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
•		Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner				

Application/Control Number: 10/631,100

Art Unit: 3735

Applicant's arguments filed 3/19/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has asserted that the examiner has mischaracterized or made misleading characterizations of the Breed references on 2 accounts. First, applicant states that by stating that the health sensor may be integrated with the weight sensor, the examiner has mischaracterized the reference. The examiner is unclear exactly how he mischaracterized the reference when Breed states very clearly in column 17, lines 17+ that the means for determining the health state may be integrated with the mean for determining the presence of occupants.

Applicant states that when Breed teaches integrating the sensors in column 17, it means they may be packaged together for installation. Applicant cites no authority or other support for this position. It is the examiner's position that integrating the sensors means placing them together, and as such, the combination meets the claim language.

Second, applicant states that it is "surely misleading" to state that Sullivan teaches that it is well known to measure the heartbeat with a fluid filled sensor. The examiner does not understand applicant's point. Applicant has admitted that Sullivan teaches a pressure sensor in a fluid filled vinyl pad to measure heart beat. This is enough to provide a teaching and there is ample motivation for the combination (substituting one equivalent sensor for another).

The examiner notes that applicant has not actually supplied any reasons when the combination is improper.

As such, the rejections stand.

Art Unit: 3735

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert L. Nasser Primary Examiner Art Unit 3735

Let 8 Mas J

April 12, 2007